

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 24, 2005. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicant has responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 11, 18-19, 21, 27, 37-38, and 47 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and more distinctly claim inventive concepts previously present in these claims. Certain amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims, and certain amendments are not required for patentability.

Claim Objections

Claims 18-19 and 38 are amended in accordance with the requirement of the Examiner to correct informalities. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the informalities. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the objections to Claims 18-19 and 38.

Claim 9 recites a "communication standard." The specification of the Application provides an example description of a "communication standard" such that Claim 9 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter the Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the objection to Claim 9. For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the objection to Claims 18, 25, 35, and 45.

Section 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-28, 31-38, and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,496,519 to Russell et al. ("*Russell*") in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,279 to Nguyen et al. ("*Nguyen*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of *Russell* and *Nguyen* as proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest elements specifically recited in

the claims. For example, the *Russell-Nguyen* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “the destination associated with each of the plurality of synchronous transport signal streams is determined by conducting a negotiation for the destination between a first transmitting interface and a second transmitting interface, the destination indicating a destination interface of a plurality of destination interfaces, each destination interface of the plurality of destination interfaces operable to transmit a synchronous transport signal stream of the plurality of synchronous transport signal streams,” recited in independent Claim 1.

The Examiner relies on Figures 1 and 2 and passages of *Nguyen* at column 6, lines 53-57, and column 5, line 61–column 6, line 12 to teach such element. (Office Action, page 4.) These passages of *Nguyen*, however, merely disclose bandwidth negotiation for a connection between a source node and a destination node. According to *Nguyen*:

Negotiation for the reservation of bandwidth is performed by a BWC [bandwidth client] 14 on behalf of an IP service or a group of IP services. During the negotiation process, the BWC 14 sends messages to and receives messages from the BWM 12 [bandwidth allocation manager]. The BWC 14 can request the establishment of a connection between a source node and a destination node by sending out a bandwidth allocation request message to the BWM 12. A management message in accordance with the invention is preferably 256 bytes long and has the following format:

Message Type: indicates the type of message, for example, BANDWIDTH ALLOCATION;
Source Address: specifies the address of the sender;
Destination Address: specifies the address of the receiver; and
Message Body: contains the contents of the message with information about the characteristics of the service.

(*Nguyen*, column 5, line 61–column 6, line 10.) *Nguyen* also discloses, “Successful bandwidth allocation negotiation establishes a connection between the source node and the destination node(s) in the SONET domain.” (*Nguyen*, column 6, lines 53-57.)

The passages of *Nguyen* merely disclose *negotiation for bandwidth*, but fail to disclose, teach, or suggest conducting a negotiation for a destination indicating a destination interface. Moreover, the passages merely disclose negotiation between a *bandwidth client* and a *bandwidth allocation manager*, but fail to disclose, teach, or suggest conducting a negotiation between transmitting interfaces of a switching system. Accordingly, the passages of *Nguyen* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “the destination associated with each of the plurality of synchronous transport signal streams is determined by conducting a negotiation

for the destination between a first transmitting interface and a second transmitting interface, a destination indicating a destination interface of a plurality of destination interfaces, each destination interface of the plurality of destination interfaces operable to transmit a synchronous transport signal stream of the plurality of synchronous transport signal streams,” recited in Claim 1.

Consequently, Claim 1 is allowable over the *Russell-Nguyen* combination proposed by the Examiner. For similar reasons, independent Claims 11, 21, 27, 38, and 47 are allowable over the *Russell-Nguyen* combination proposed by the Examiner.

The dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claims and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the references of the rejection. Because Applicant believes he has amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the references of the rejection, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicant has not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicant, however, remains ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-28, 31-38, and 41-47.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicant believes no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

KI/lis

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494
Date: January 5, 2006

Customer Number: 05073